

LIBRARY  
OF MICH

FEB 5 1926

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at  
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of  
March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on  
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XIX, No. 13

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1926

WHOLE No. 516

## *Special Offers*

### THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

#### I. Back Volumes:

- (a) Volumes 1-6, **unbound**, at \$1.00 each;
- (b) Volumes 16-18, **unbound**, at \$1.50 each;
- (c) Complete sets, 18 volumes, **unbound**, at \$24.00.

**Note:** Volumes 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 can not be sold separately.

II. General Index to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, Volumes I-XVI, and Index to Volume XVII, bound together, in cloth (112 pages), \$2.25.

#### IMPORTANT

Remittances must accompany orders. The prices given above are offered only to those have paid dues for the current year of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States (May 1, 1925-April 30, 1926, or have subscribed to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, Volume XIX (October 1, 1925-May 31, 1926).

Send Orders, With Remittances,

to

**CHARLES KNAPP, 1737 Sedgwick Ave., N. Y. City**

## They Meet the New Requirements In Latin

### Harkness, Kirtland and Williams' Cicero's Nine Orations and Impeachment of Verres

Including the First Oration against Catiline, the Oration for Archias, and the newly prescribed **Plunder of Syracuse**....\$1.72

### Gleason's A Term of Ovid, Revised

Including these required selections from the **Metamorphoses**: Deucalion and Pyrrha, Phaethon, The Golden Fleece, Philemon and Baucis, and Atalanta's Race.....\$1.12

### Cicero's Impeachment of Verres (Wightman)

Providing in pamphlet form this new requirement not generally found in School editions of Cicero's Orations.....\$0.16

## AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA



*From Greenough, Kittredge,  
and Jenkins's Virgil's  
Aeneid.*

## GREENOUGH-KITTREDGE-JENKINS VIRGIL'S AENEID and OVID'S METAMORPHOSES

Meeting all the requirements of the Latin class. Books I-VI of the Aeneid, selections and summaries of Books VII-XII, introduction, notes, and vocabulary, are included. A supplementary pamphlet by Kittredge and Jenkins supplies the Ovid selections required for College entrance in 1926-1928.

## GINN AND COMPANY

BOSTON  
ATLANTANEW YORK  
DALLASLONDON  
COLUMBUSCHICAGO  
SAN FRANCISCO

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 13

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1926

WHOLE No. 516

## PROFESSOR GILBERT MURRAY ON THE STOIC PHILOSOPHY (RELIGION)

IN THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.105-106 I made some reference to a book by Professor Gilbert Murray, entitled *Tradition and Progress* (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1922. Pp. 221). I wish now to return to this book, to discuss one chapter of it, that in which the author treats *The Stoic Philosophy* (88-106).

Professor Murray begins by declaring that Stoicism may be called either a philosophy or a religion (88). "It was a religion in its exalted passion; it was a philosophy inasmuch as it made no pretence to magical powers or supernatural knowledge".

... I believe that it represents a way of looking at the world and the practical problems of life which possesses still a permanent interest for the human race, and a permanent power of inspiration. I shall approach it, therefore, rather as a psychologist than as a philosopher or historian. ... I shall merely try as best I can to make intelligible its great central principles and the almost irresistible appeal which they made to so many of the best minds of antiquity.

Something much like this was said, quite independently, I take it, by Mr. Henry Dwight Sedgwick, in his book, *Marcus Aurelius. A Biography*, etc. See Miss Goodale's review of this book in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.60-61. Professor Murray evidently has no monopoly of thought on classical topics.

Professor Murray thinks that religions fall into two broad classes—religions which are suited for times of good government and prosperity, and religions which are suited for times of bad government and adversity (89).

... Stoicism, like Christianity, was primarily a religion for the oppressed, a religion of defence and defiance; but, like Christianity it had the requisite power of adaptation. Consistently or inconsistently, it opened its wings to embrace the needs both of success and of failure.

Zeno began, says Professor Murray, by asserting the existence of the real world, that is, with uncompromising materialism. Furthermore, he held that we may know this real world by the evidence of our senses. To say that our senses deceive us is to speak incorrectly. Sense-impressions are always right; the trouble is that we at times interpret them wrongly. In other cases, we misinterpret the impression, which is true in itself. On this foundation Zeno built his doctrine of ethics and conduct. In the doctrine, the fundamental principle was that "Nothing but Goodness is Good" (93). Goodness is what a man is himself (94); it depends not in the slightest degree upon such things as rank, social distinction, riches, health, pleasure, barriers of race or nation. These things are all external; "... no earthly power can make you good or bad except yourself, and to be good or bad is the only thing that matters" (94). To be good was to live in accordance with *phósis*.

This word Professor Murray will not translate by 'nature', but rather by 'growth', or 'the process of growth' (96):

It is *Phusis* which gradually shapes or tries to shape every living thing into a more perfect form. It shapes the seed, by infinite and exact gradations, into the oak; the blind puppy into the good hunting-dog; the savage tribe into the civilized city. If you analyze this process, you find that *Phusis* is shaping each thing towards the fulfilment of its own function—that is, towards the good.

The famous definition of *Phusis*, 'living in accordance with Nature', means to Professor Murray living "according to the spirit which makes the world grow and progress" (97). *Phusis*, then, to the Stoic, is a soul, or a life-force, running through all matter as the soul or life of a man runs through all his limbs; it is the soul of the world. From another point of view, *Phusis*, the life of the world, is the law of Nature (97), a natural law which is alive, which is itself life. "It becomes indistinguishable from a purpose, the purpose of the great world-process. It is like a foreseeing, forethinking power—*Pronoia*..."

... As a principle of providence or forethought it comes to be regarded as God, the nearest approach to a definite personal God which is admitted by the austere logic of Stoicism. And, since it must be in some sense material, it is made of the finest material there is; it is made of fire, not ordinary fire, but what they called intellectual fire. A fire which is present in a warm, live man, and not in a cold, dead man; a fire which has consciousness and life, and is not subject to decay. This fire, *Phusis*, God, is in all creation.

Finally, therefore, Goodness is acting according to *Phusis*, in harmony with the will of God (98).

There were two types of Stoics, says Professor Murray (99). Of these two types, both equally orthodox, one defies the world, the other works with the world. One is the scorner of all earthly things; with him, everything outside of *Phusis* itself is "indifferent". The other type, thinking of *Phusis* as a purpose or forethought which, though sometimes failing, is always working restlessly for the good of the world, works in the same spirit, seeking, within the limits of his powers and possibilities, to help a fraction of the world and to serve humanity. In a phrase translated by Pliny from a Greek Stoic, *Deus est mortali iuvare mortalem*, "man's true God is the helping of man" (99).

No wonder such a religion appealed to kings and statesmen and Roman governors. Most of the successors of Alexander—we may say most of the principal kings in existence in the generations following Zeno—professed themselves Stoics. The most famous of all Stoics, Marcus Aurelius, found his religion not only in meditation and religious exercises, but in working some sixteen hours a day for the good practical government of the Roman Empire.

The Stoics felt that there was an inconsistency

between the two types of Stoic virtue, and tried to remove it, in the following way (100). A good boot-maker or a good shepherd must do his work well, or he will cease to be good. To do his work well, he must prefer certain things to others, even though the things he prefers are not really in themselves good.

... It is thus that Nature, or Physis, herself works when she shapes the seed into the tree, or the blind puppy into the good hound. The perfection of the tree or hound is in itself indifferent, a thing of no ultimate value. Yet the goodness of Nature lies in working for that perfection....

An interesting passage is the following (103):

Thus Stoicism, whatever its weaknesses, fulfilled the two main demands that man makes upon his religion: it gave him armour when the world was predominantly evil, and it encouraged him forward when the world was predominantly good. It afforded guidance both for the saint and the public servant. And in developing this two-fold character I think it was not influenced by mere inconstancy. It was trying to meet the actual truth of the situation. For in most systems it seems to be recognized that in the Good Life there is both an element of outward striving and an element of inward peace. There are things which we must try to attain, yet it is not really the attainment that matters; it is the seeking. And, consequently, in some sense, the real victory is with him who fought best, not with the man who happened to win. For beyond all the accidents of war, beyond the noise of armies and groans of the dying, there is the presence of some eternal Friend. It is our relation to Him that matters.

In his concluding pages (103-106), Professor Murray dwells, in a very interesting way, upon what he calls "the vast assumption" of the Stoics—"the assumption of the Eternal Purpose"—a beneficent purpose. There is, not only in all religions, but in practically all philosophies, some belief that man is not quite alone in the universe, but is met in his endeavors towards the good by some external help or sympathy. We find it everywhere in the unsophisticated man. We find it in the unguarded self-revelations of the most severe and conscientious atheists. But, after all, the belief in "the Friend behind phenomena" is unproven (105).

In the second quotation given above from Professor Murray's chapter occurs this sentence: "Stoicism, like Christianity, was primarily a religion for the oppressed, a religion of defence and defiance..." I find it hard to reconcile this pronouncement with the very interesting contrast which, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 19.88-90, Professor Boas drew between the value set by Greek philosophical systems on sovereignty, particularly as an ideal to be reached by the perfect man or the wise man, and the Christian position, that sovereignty was not a possible human achievement (90). I can easily conceive of Stoicism as a religion or a philosophy of defiance. But I can not, by any stretch of imagination, conceive of Christianity as such a defiance. Professor Murray is, it seems to me, at times "intrigued", as certain English writers say, by words, especially his own words, and as a result his words are, at times, substanceless. A striking instance of this weakness is to be found in the concluding paragraph of the chapter under discussion, too long to be quoted here.

Over against Professor Murray's pronouncements on

Stoicism as a religion I set part of a paragraph in Professor A. Y. Campbell's book, *Horace, A New Interpretation* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 19.68-70). On pages 116-121 Professor Campbell is explaining why Horace did not write drama, instead of merely writing about drama. The main reason was that "he was not quite adequately equipped in feeling" (118). On pages 120-121 we find these words:

... To be a dramatist it is *not* enough\* to know what duty is. ... The fact is, to be a good tragedian, no less than to be a good man, one must not be moral only, one must be religious. It is, ultimately, a matter of emotion; of emotional relation to something not actual; of love of God, or love of your own puppets. And Stoicism, after all, was not properly speaking (though it is often convenient to call it so in comparison with the Thales-to-Aristotle philosophy) a religion at all; it was no more a religion than its modern counterpart Christian Science, a popular metaphysic which seems to have brought comfort and stability to many.... Nor is it easy to imagine Horace becoming whole-heartedly devoted to anything external to himself.

One other comment I will allow myself here on Professor Murray's comparison—or may I say identification?—of the spirit of Christianity with the spirit of Stoicism. Such an attitude had passed away, I had supposed, with the efforts, once made so earnestly by honest souls, to prove that St. Paul had met and influenced Seneca. In 1877, Messrs. Harper and Brothers published an edition of four of Seneca's Moral Essays, together with some extracts from his Epistles. The book contained "An Introduction Copious Notes and Scripture Parallels", said the title-page. The editors were John F. Hurst and Henry C. Whiting.\* Mr. Hurst was, I think, later a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Preface to the Revised Edition of this work is dated in April, 1884. Section VII of the Introduction (34-40) is entitled *Relations of Seneca and St. Paul*. On page 37 the editors say, "It is not at all improbable that St. Paul and Seneca were acquainted with each other". They bring the Section to a close with these words (39-40):

... Seneca's mental attitude and achievements prove him to have been ready for at least a guarded interchange of opinions with Paul, and it may well have happened that the influence of the philosopher at Nero's court had weight in securing such delay of the Apostle's trial as resulted later in the latter's liberation and in his making one more missionary tour.

When first I read this Section, over thirty years ago, I felt instinctively that the editors, in their zeal, had overlooked, even as Professor Murray did, years later, one all-important point, the fundamental difference in spirit between Stoicism and Christianity. Between a system of thought which declares, as Stoicism declares, that man can become all-sufficient, in and of himself, utterly independent of all externals ("sovereign", as Professor Boas would, I think, express it), and a religion which declares that man in and of himself is naught, there surely is, in matters of the spirit, a great gulf fixed, which can in no wise be bridged. Of morality, Christianity, of course, has no monopoly.

CHARLES KNAPP



## CAESAR'S TRIUMPHS

From his wars in Gaul Caesar passed directly into the Civil Wars; then followed the Alexandrine War, the brief campaign in Pontus, and, finally, the war which ended in the overthrow of Scipio and the other Pompeians in Africa. It was only when this was completed and Caesar had returned to Rome that he had the opportunity to celebrate a triumph, the first which fortune had granted him.

Fourteen years earlier he had had one almost in his grasp. At the close of his propraetorship in Spain he had returned to Rome, in 60 B. C., with the firm expectation of celebrating a triumph. As a candidate for the consulship, he was, however, under obligation to campaign in person in the city, while as a prospective triumphator he must remain without the walls until he entered with his troops in the triumphal procession. Caesar was caught between the two laws. The date of the election had already been set when he reached Rome, and his presence in the city was necessary if he was to stand for office. Efforts to secure release from the necessity of canvassing in person were blocked by Caesar's enemies, and so to secure the consulship he let the triumph go<sup>1</sup>.

Accordingly, it was in 46 B. C., on his return from his African campaign, that his first triumph occurred; the victor celebrated, however, not one triumph, but four, all in a single month (August or September of the unrevised calendar)<sup>2</sup>, though not on successive days, a brief interval separating each from the triumph which followed it<sup>3</sup>.

The first, that over Gaul, was the most magnificent of all<sup>4</sup>; then came the Alexandrine, next that over Pontus, and, finally, the African.

To these four triumphs Caesar subsequently added one, the Spanish, in October, 45 B. C.<sup>5</sup>, after the defeat of the sons of Pompey, at Munda.

Magnificent and extraordinary were the triumphs with their attendant gladiatorial combats, theatrical performances, chariot races, combats with wild beasts, athletic contests, and naval battle<sup>6</sup>. Long expected they had been<sup>7</sup>, and great expenditure was of course anticipated. And so, says Suetonius<sup>8</sup>, "such a throng flocked to all these shows from every quarter, that many strangers had to lodge in tents pitched in the streets or along the roads, and the press was often such that many were crushed to death, including two senators".

The Gallic triumph was, then, the first and the most magnificent. This was natural enough, for it represented victory in a war of nine years' duration, a war in which there had been no slaughter of fellow Romans, a war which had seen the defeat of Gauls, Germans,

and Britons, and had taken Caesar and his soldiers over the Rhine into Germany and over the Ocean into Britain. It had been the longest of his wars and had brought much territory under the dominion of Rome; it was unquestionably the one in which he might take most pride; it had brought him *supplicationes* longer than any hitherto voted to any Roman<sup>9</sup>. Plutarch's statement, into the accuracy of which we need not inquire, clearly sets forth the light in which it was regarded: "For although it was not full ten years that he waged war in Gaul, he took by storm more than eight hundred cities, subdued three hundred nations, and fought pitched battles at different times with three million men, of whom he slew one million in hand to hand fighting and took as many more prisoners". For this, his greatest military achievement, he naturally desired to make the triumph most magnificent.

In the procession were borne representations of the Rhine and the Rhone, and a golden figure of the Ocean in captivity<sup>10</sup>; there was, too, a statue of the city of Marseilles<sup>11</sup>. Among the throngs of captives appeared Vercingetorix, the gallant Gallic chieftain, who was executed by Caesar at the close of the triumph<sup>12</sup>.

In the procession, too, was borne money, as well as crowns of gold. The total for the various triumphs amounted, it is said, to 60,500 or 65,000 talents (roughly equivalent to \$70,000,000, or more), and 2,822 crowns of gold weighing 20,414 pounds<sup>13</sup>.

According to their usual custom, the soldiers freely "jested about his love for Cleopatra and his sojourn at the court of Nicomedes, the ruler of Bithynia, inasmuch as he had once been at his court when a lad; indeed, they even declared that the Gauls had been enslaved by Caesar, but Caesar by Nicomedes"<sup>14</sup>. This clearly occurred on the occasion of the triumph over Gaul, for Suetonius says<sup>15</sup>:

... Finally, in his Gallic triumph his soldiers, among the bantering songs which are usually sung by those who follow the chariot, shouted these lines, which became a by-word:

"All the Gauls did Caesar vanquish, Nicomedes vanquished him;  
Lo! now Caesar rides in triumph, victor over all the Gauls,  
Nicomedes does not triumph, who subdued the conqueror!"

Another couplet sung at the same triumph by the soldiers ran<sup>16</sup>:

Men of Rome, keep close your consorts, here's a bald adulterer.  
Gold in Gaul you spent in dalliance, which you borrowed here in Rome.

It was at this triumph, too, without doubt, that the soldiers sang of their fare of wild cabbage (*chara*, or *lapsana*) at the siege of Dyrrachium and complained of the meagerness of their rewards for the suffering they had undergone (*exprobravere lapsana se vixisse apud*

<sup>1</sup>Suetonius, Iulius 18.2; Plutarch, Caesar 13, Cato Minor 31; Appian, B. C. 2.8; Dio 37.54.1-2, 44.41.3-4.

<sup>2</sup>From *Bellum Africanum* 98.2 it is clear that Caesar did not reach Rome till late in July. Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*, 3.550-551, place the four triumphs in August; Eduard Meyer, *Caesar's Monarchie*, 386, puts them in September.

<sup>3</sup>Suetonius, Iulius 37.1: *primum et excellentissimum triumphum egit Gallicum*.

<sup>4</sup>Velleius Paterculus 2.56.3. <sup>5</sup>Suetonius, Iulius 39.

<sup>6</sup>Compare E. G. Sihler, *Annals of Caesar*, 234.

<sup>7</sup>Iulius 39.4 (all translations of Suetonius in this paper are from the version by Professor John C. Rolfe, in the Loeb Classical Library).

<sup>8</sup>Caesar, B. G. 2.35, 4.38, 7.90.

<sup>9</sup>Caesar 15 (all translations of Plutarch in this paper are from the version by Bernadotte Perrin, in the Loeb Classical Library).

<sup>10</sup>Plorus 2.13 (4.2).88.

<sup>11</sup>Cicero, *Philippics* 8.18; *De Officiis* 2.28.

<sup>12</sup>Dio 43.19.4. See Mr. T. Rice Holmes's discussion, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, 821.

<sup>13</sup>Appian, B. C. 2.102.

<sup>14</sup>Suetonius, Iulius 49.4.

<sup>15</sup>Dio 43.20.2.

<sup>16</sup>Suetonius, Iulius 51.

Durrachium, praemiorum parsimoniam cavillantes)<sup>17</sup>.

As Caesar rode through the Velabrum, "directly opposite the temple of Fortune built by Lucullus", says Dio<sup>18</sup>, on the day of his Gallic triumph, the axle of his chariot broke, and he was all but thrown out. At the close of the procession, "he climbed up the stairs of the Capitol on his knees", so Dio tells us<sup>19</sup>.

A few days later came the Alexandrine triumph. Captives taken in the naval engagement on the Nile<sup>20</sup> appeared in it. On the *fercula* were borne a representation of the Nile and one of the Pharos, the light-house<sup>21</sup>. Arsinoë, the Egyptian princess, was one of the captives, but "the sight of Arsinoë, a woman and once considered a queen, in chains,—a spectacle which had never yet been seen, at least in Rome,—aroused very great pity . . . . She, to be sure, was released out of consideration for her brothers . . ."<sup>22</sup>. A representation of the death of Achilles and Pothinus, Pompey's murderers, was borne in the procession and called forth the applause of the crowd<sup>23</sup>.

Next followed the triumph over Pontus and Pharnaces. In it Caesar "displayed among the show-pieces of the procession an inscription of but three words, 'I came, I saw, I conquered', not indicating the events of the war, as the others did, but the speed with which it was finished"<sup>24</sup>. There was also a representation of Pharnaces in flight, which set the throng to laughing<sup>25</sup>.

Last in the series was the African triumph. It was formally not one for the victory at Thapsus over Scipio, but a triumph over Mauretania and its king Juba<sup>26</sup>. The son of King Juba, himself named Juba, later an historian, was then as an infant led a captive in the procession<sup>27</sup>. Plutarch<sup>28</sup> calls him "the most fortunate captive ever taken, since from being a Barbarian and a Numidian, he came to be enrolled among the most learned historians of Hellas".

Appian (B. C. 2.101) writes thus<sup>29</sup>:

Although <Caesar> took care not to inscribe any Roman names in his triumph (as it would have been unseemly in his eyes and base and inauspicious in those of the Roman people to triumph over fellow-citizens), yet all these misfortunes were represented in the processions and the men also by various images and pictures . . . . The people . . . groaned . . . when they saw the picture of Lucius Scipio, the general-in-chief, wounded in the breast by his own hand, casting himself into the sea, and Petreius committing self-destruction at the banquet, and Cato torn open by himself like a wild beast.

The Spanish triumph was not celebrated until 45 B. C., when Caesar returned from his victory at Munda. This triumph, says Plutarch<sup>30</sup>, "vexed the Romans as nothing else had done. For it commemorated no victory over foreign commanders or barbarian kings, but the utter annihilation of the sons and

the family of the mightiest of the Romans, who had fallen upon misfortune. . . ."

The first group of triumphs was accompanied by a variety of most costly spectacles. The following are enumerated by Suetonius<sup>31</sup>: "a combat of gladiators and also stage-plays in every ward all over the city, performed too by actors of all languages, as well as races in the circus, athletic contests, and a sham sea-fight"<sup>32</sup>. The new forum which Caesar had constructed and which was named after him was dedicated at this time, along with the Temple of Venus Genetrix; more beautiful, declared Dio, was this forum than the Roman Forum. Combats between wild beasts and gladiators took place, and "a battle between two opposing armies, in which five hundred foot-soldiers, twenty elephants, and thirty horsemen engaged on each side"<sup>33</sup>. For the athletic contests a temporary stadium was built, and "finally", so Dio states (43.23.4), "he produced a naval battle, not on the sea nor on a lake, but on land; for he hollowed out a certain tract on the Campus Martius and after flooding it introduced ships into it".

Caesar entertained the people at dinner at the close of the four triumphs. When the dinner was over, he was escorted home by a procession of forty elephants carrying torches, twenty on each side<sup>34</sup>.

To add the element of novelty, Caesar then for the first time displayed the giraffe in Rome<sup>35</sup>.

"... he had expended countless sums on all that array . . .", says Dio<sup>36</sup>, and, save for the complaints of the soldiers who regretted that these sums were not distributed among them in addition to the sums they had received, we can feel sure that the dominant feeling among the populace was of pride, curiosity, and eager interest, rather than grief; this doubtless was felt by some, but the mob with a momentary touch of regret for a Pompey or a Cato was willing to turn quickly to the next object of interest, the next novelty that Caesar was about to exhibit.

Of Caesar and his shows, Pliny says<sup>37</sup>: "One who was an admirer of luxury might perhaps on this occasion have enumerated the spectacles which he exhibited, the treasures which he lavished away, and the magnitude of his public works . . . ." The term that Velleius<sup>38</sup> applies to the various spectacles is *magnificentissima*. Magnificence clearly was the dominant note.

Each of these triumphs had its *apparatus*, made of a distinctive material. Precisely what the triumphal *apparatus* was is not clear, but the term certainly included the *fercula* on which the booty, the statues, and the representations of captured cities and the like were carried. Velleius tells us precisely the material employed for the *apparatus* of each triumph. Citrus wood from Africa was used for the Gallic triumph, acanthus (really acacia) for the Pontic, tortoise-shell for the Alexandrine, ivory for the African, and silver for the Spanish. It seems to be clear that in each case

<sup>17</sup>Pliny, N. H. 19.144.

<sup>18</sup>43.21.1. Compare also Suetonius, Iulius 37.2. <sup>19</sup>43.21.2.

<sup>20</sup>Appian, B. C. 2.101.

<sup>21</sup>Florus 2.13 (4.2). 88.

<sup>22</sup>Dio 43.19.2-4 (the translations of Dio in this paper are from the version by Dr. Earnest Cary, in the Loeb Classical Library). Florus 2.13 (4.2). 88 gives the impression that a representation of Arsinoë appeared; this is doubtless incorrect.

<sup>23</sup>Appian, B. C. 2.101.

<sup>24</sup>Suetonius, Iulius 37.2.

<sup>25</sup>Appian, B. C. 2.101.

<sup>26</sup>Plutarch, Caesar 55.

<sup>27</sup>Caesar 55.

<sup>28</sup>The translations of Appian in this paper are from the version by Mr. Horace White, in the Loeb Classical Library.

<sup>29</sup>Caesar 56.4.

<sup>30</sup>Iulius 39. <sup>31</sup>For details see Suetonius, Iulius 39; Dio 43.22-24.

<sup>32</sup>Dio 43.22.1; Suetonius, Iulius 37.2. See the discussion in Drumann-Groebe, Geschichte Roms, 3.554, note 2.

<sup>33</sup>Dio 43.23.1-2.

<sup>34</sup>N. H. 7.94.

<sup>35</sup>43.24.1.

<sup>36</sup>2.56.1.

the material used had a special connection with the country over which the triumph was being celebrated, save in the case of Gaul, for which citrus, the costliest of all woods, was used. Indeed, each material, save possibly the acanthus, ranked among the objects of luxury of the Roman world. In other words, the choice of the material depended in part on a relation to the country over which Caesar was then triumphing, in part (perhaps even more) on its costliness. In Pliny's list of things most costly we find citrus wood, tortoise-shell, and ivory; obviously silver belongs with them<sup>37</sup>.

A desire to impress the populace by the cost and the splendor of these shows was natural enough.

It is, moreover, important to recall that Pompey had made magnificence the aim of his last triumph. Of it Velleius Paterculus<sup>38</sup> says: *magnificentissimum . . . de tot regibus per biduum egit triumphum*. Eutropius even declares that *nulla unquam pompa triumphi similis fuit*<sup>39</sup>. And Plutarch<sup>40</sup> points out, that, while he was on his campaigns, Pompey "accepted only such <i. e. presents of great value> as he thought might serve to adorn the temples of the gods and add to the splendor of his triumph". This triumph, Pompey's third and greatest, occurred in 61 B. C. It lasted two days, beginning on September 28; the second day of the triumph was Pompey's birthday<sup>41</sup>.

Appian's colorful account<sup>42</sup> is as follows:

... He was awarded a triumph exceeding in brilliancy any that had gone before, being now only thirty-five years of age<sup>43</sup>. It occupied two successive days and many nations were represented in the procession from Pontus, Armenia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, and all Syria, besides Albanians, Heniochi, Achaeans of Scythia, and Eastern Iberians. Seven hundred undamaged ships were brought into the harbors. In the triumphal procession were two-horse carriages and litters laden with gold or with other ornaments of various kinds, also the couch of Darius, the son of Hystaspes, the throne and sceptre of Mithridates Eupator himself, and his image, eight cubits high, made of solid gold, and 75,100,000 drachmas of silver coin; also an infinite number of wagons carrying arms and beaks of ships, and a multitude of captives and pirates, none of them bound, but all arrayed in their native costumes.

Before Pompey himself, at the head of the procession, went the satraps, sons, and generals of the kings against whom he had fought, who were present (some having been captured and others given as hostages) to the number of 324. . . . Moreover, a tablet was carried along with this inscription: "Ships with brazen beaks captured, 800; cities founded in Cappadocia, 8; in Cilicia and Coele-Syria, 20; in Palestine the one which is now Seleucia. Kings conquered: Tigranes the Armenian, Artoces the Iberian, Oroezes the Albanian, Darius the Mede, Aretas the Nabataean, Antiochus of Commagene". These were the facts recorded in the inscription. Pompey himself was borne in a chariot studded with gems, wearing, it was said, a cloak of Alexander the Great. . . .

This will give some notion of the magnificence of the triumph; added details may be found in Dio<sup>44</sup>, Plu-

tarch<sup>45</sup>, Velleius Paterculus<sup>46</sup>, and Pliny<sup>47</sup>. A quotation from the latter's account may be worth reading<sup>48</sup>:

... On the occasion of his third triumph . . . he displayed in public, with its pieces, a chess-board, made of two precious stones, three feet in width by two in length—and to leave no doubt that the resources of Nature do become exhausted, I will here observe, that no precious stones are to be found at the present day, at all approaching such dimensions as these; as also that there was upon this board a moon of solid gold, thirty pounds in weight!—three banquetting-couches; vessels for nine waiters, in gold and precious stones; three golden statues of Minerva, Mars, and Apollo; thirty-three crowns adorned with pearls; a square mountain of gold, with stags upon it, lions, and all kinds of fruit, and surrounded with a vine of gold; as also a musaeum, adorned with pearls, with an horologe upon the top of it.

There was a likeness also in pearls of Pompeius himself, his noble countenance, with the hair thrown back from the forehead, delighting the eye. Yes, I say, those frank features . . . were here displayed in pearls! . . . the display being more the triumph of luxury than the triumph of conquest . . . . To the state, he presented two thousand millions of sesterces; to the legati and quaestors who had exerted themselves in defense of the sea coast, he gave one thousand millions of sesterces; and to each individual soldier, six thousand sesterces. . . .

As his great rival had thus dazzled the eyes of the Romans by the magnificence of his last triumph, surely Caesar must have realized that to outstrip it was of the utmost importance.

That Caesar was thinking, in the period preceding it, of the glorious triumph to come seems certain. The one that he might have had for his victories during his praetorship he had been compelled to abandon in order to stand for the consulship<sup>49</sup>. The triumphs ahead would be his first, and for a series of great achievements.

Cicero, in his oration *De Provinciis Consularibus*<sup>50</sup>, delivered in 56 B. C., alluded to the triumph to which Caesar was already entitled:

*Qua re, si qui hominem non diligunt, nihil est quod eum de provincia devocent; ad gloriam devocant, ad triumphum . . . . Sed si ille hac tam eximia fortuna propter utilitatem rei publicae frui non properat, ut omnia illa conficiat. . . .*

Shortly after he says<sup>51</sup>,

*. . . si in patriam, si ad deos penates, si ad eam dignitatem quam in civitate sibi propositam videt, si ad iucundissimos liberos, si ad clarissimum generum redire properaret, si in Capitolium invehi victor cum illa insigni laurea gestiret. . . .*

Cicero alludes to it again in this oration when he asks<sup>52</sup>, *. . . laurea illa magnis periculis parta amittit longo intervallo viriditatem?* And just prior to the outbreak of the Civil War, when it was proposed in the Senate that a triumph be decreed to Cicero, "he protested that it would give him more satisfaction, when terms had been arranged between Pompey and Caesar, to follow the latter's triumphal car"<sup>53</sup>. More-

<sup>37</sup>This paragraph is a brief summary of an article entitled *The Apparatus of Caesar's Triumphs*, *Philological Quarterly* 3.257-266 (October, 1924).

<sup>38</sup>2.40.3. <sup>39</sup>16.16.

<sup>40</sup>Pompey 36.

<sup>41</sup>Mithridatica 116-117.

<sup>42</sup>Pliny, N. H. 37.13. <sup>43</sup>Actually forty-five; see Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*, 4.332.

<sup>44</sup>37.21.

<sup>45</sup>Pompey 45.

<sup>46</sup>2.40.3.

<sup>47</sup>N. H. 37.13-16 (the translation is by John Bostock and H. T. Riley, in Bohn's Classical Library).

<sup>48</sup>For a detailed account of the triumph see Drumann-Groebe, 4.492-498.

<sup>49</sup>Suetonius, *Julius* 18.2. See also the first two paragraphs of this paper.

<sup>50</sup>29.

<sup>51</sup>35.

<sup>52</sup>29.

<sup>53</sup>Plutarch, *Cicero* 37.1.



over, in Cicero's letters of February, 49, we find references to the second consulship and to the triumph which had been offered to Caesar by Pompey. Thus, writing to Atticus on February 27, 49, Cicero says<sup>54</sup>: *consulatus tamen alter et triumphus amplissimus deferebatur <Caesari>*.

To the enormous cost of his future triumphs and spectacles Caesar gave thought during his wars. Says Dio<sup>55</sup>: "All this he did, not out of malice, but because his expenditures were on a vast scale and because he was intending to lay out still more upon his legions, his triumph, and everything else that gratified his pride"<sup>56</sup>.

And there can be no doubt that vast shows were confidently looked for by the Roman people on Caesar's return. Pompey alleged<sup>57</sup> that Caesar's inability to satisfy all the expectations of the people was the reason for his readiness to plunge the State into civil war: *Gnaeus Pompeius ita dictitabat, quod neque opera consummare quae instituerat, neque populi expectationem quam de adventu sui fecerat privatis opibus explere posset, turbare omnia ac permiscere voluisse*. Among the things expected on Caesar's coming to Rome must have been a triumphal show, costly and magnificent. And, if in 49 B. C. the expectations of the people were so high, what must they have been in 46 B. C., when Pompey was defeated and slain and Caesar stood in his stead as *domitor mundi*?

There is, moreover, another fact of interest in connection with Pompey's triumphs<sup>58</sup>. It is clear that Pompey had become identified in the mind of the people as the triply triumphant, owing to his triumph of 79 B. C. over Hiarbas of Numidia, that of 71 B. C. for his victories in Spain, and that in 61 B. C. after his successes in the East, particularly his victory over Mithridates. A considerable group of references in Cicero<sup>59</sup>, Lucan<sup>60</sup>, Plutarch<sup>61</sup>, Pliny<sup>62</sup>, and other writers alludes to this trio of triumphs and frequently in such a manner as to make one feel that the reference to three triumphs at once identified Pompey. We surely derive the impression that the association of three triumphs with Pompey was a common one, from such expressions as that of Propertius<sup>63</sup>, . . . *tris ubi Pompeio detraxit harena triumphos!* Pompey himself wore a seal ring on which three trophies were carved, and it was only the receipt of this ring in Rome after his murder that convinced the people that Pompey was really dead<sup>64</sup>.

Pompey was noted not only for his three triumphs, but also because he had triumphed over each of the three continents, Europe, Africa, and Asia. A series of references illustrates this point. Perhaps Plutarch will serve as an example<sup>65</sup>:

But that which most enhanced his glory and had never been the lot of any Roman before, was that he

celebrated his third victory over the third continent. For others before him had celebrated three triumphs; but he celebrated his first over Libya, his second over Europe, and this his last over Asia; so that he seemed in a way to have included the whole world in his three triumphs.

Through these three triumphs he became a world conqueror<sup>66</sup>: *Pompeiusque orbis domitor per trisque triumphos ante deum princeps* . . . . Indeed, in Pompey's third triumph, after all the other trophies "came one huge one, decked out in costly fashion and bearing an inscription stating that it was a trophy of the inhabited world"<sup>67</sup>.

Pompey was, it is clear, famed not merely as *ter triumphans*, but as triumphing over the three continents, and thus, in a certain sense, over the entire inhabited world.

When, then, Caesar came to celebrate his triumphs, it became necessary for him, if he was to overshadow Pompey's number, to celebrate *four* triumphs, and his triumphs equally with Pompey's included the three continents, Europe by the triumph over Gaul, Africa by the triumph over Africa, and Asia by the triumph over Pontus. Moreover, his *four* came in one month; Pompey's three were spread over a period of eighteen years. These triumphs over the three continents made it clearly visible that Caesar was Pompey's successor as *domitor mundi*.

The comparison with Pompey could not fail to come to the minds of the populace. Just so does Pliny<sup>68</sup>, after describing Pompey's achievements, turn to the natural comparison with Caesar:

If anyone should wish, on the other hand, in a similar manner, to pass in review the exploits of Caesar, who has shown himself greater still than Pompey, why then he must enumerate all the countries in the world, a task, I may say, without an end.

And this comparison Caesar would naturally desire to have made.

The famous utterance, *Veni, vidi, vici*, is an illustration of this<sup>69</sup>. It was apparently used first in a letter (or letters) written at the time of Caesar's rapid victory over Pharnaces, the King of Pontus, at Zela<sup>70</sup>, and was employed again a year later on a banner at the time of the Pontic triumph<sup>71</sup>.

It seems very clear that Caesar thus stressed the rapidity of his victory over Pharnaces to contrast it with the long struggle which Pompey had had to carry on with the same people under Mithridates, father of Pharnaces. Appian<sup>72</sup> tells us: "Here <i. e. at Zela> it is said that he exclaimed, 'O fortunate Pompey, who wast considered and named the Great for warring against such men as these in the time of Mithridates, the father of this man'. Of this battle he wrote to Rome the words, 'I came, I saw, I conquered'". Suetonius<sup>73</sup> represents Caesar as *crebro commemorans Pompei felicitatem, cui praecipua militiae laus de tam inbelli genere hostium contigisset*.

<sup>54</sup>Ad Att. 8.11 d. 7. Compare also Ad Att. 8.26.2.

<sup>55</sup>42.49.3.

<sup>56</sup>Compare also Suetonius, Iulius 54.3.

<sup>57</sup>Suetonius, Iulius 30.2.

<sup>58</sup>This paragraph is a summary of an article entitled Pompey's Three Triumphs, Classical Philology 19.277-279 (July, 1924).

<sup>59</sup>De Divinatione 2.22; In Pisonem 58; De Officiis 1.78; Pro Balbo 9, 16; Pro Sestio 129.

<sup>60</sup>7.685-686, 8.553, 8.13-815, 9.177-178, 599-600.

<sup>61</sup>Pompey 40, 45.

<sup>62</sup>N. H. 37.13.

<sup>63</sup>3.11.35.

<sup>64</sup>Dio 42.18.3.

<sup>65</sup>Pompey 45.

<sup>66</sup>Manilius 1.793-794.

<sup>67</sup>Dio 37.21.2.

<sup>68</sup>N. H. 7.99.

<sup>69</sup>This discussion summarizes an article entitled *Veni, Vidi, Vici*, Philological Quarterly 4.151-156. Compare also a note by Dr. H. W. Gilmer, Caesar's Thrasiconal Boast, Philological Quarterly 4.157.

<sup>70</sup>Plutarch, Caesar 50, and Apophthegmata C. Caesaris 12; Appian, B. C. 2.91.

<sup>71</sup>Suetonius, Iulius 37.2.

<sup>72</sup>B. C. 2.91.

<sup>73</sup>Iulius 35.2.



It is possible, moreover, that the source of the phrase lay in a *titulus* which conceivably was employed by Pompey at the time of his great triumph of 61 B. C. and which may have read Tigranes Mithridatesque pugnans, vincuntur, fugiunt. Caesar's *Veni, vidi, vici* may have been a direct reference to such a *titulus* of Pompey.

What most influenced the form of the 'boast' one cannot say. Professor J. S. Reid<sup>74</sup> quotes a very apposite fragment from Democritus running as follows: 'Ο κόσμος σκήνη: ὁ βίος πάροδος · ἡλθες, εἶδες, ἀπῆλθες. But it seems more likely that for its form Caesar was indebted to Terence, the author of whom he was so fond, for in Phormio 103-104 we find the strikingly similar sentence *Imus, venimus, videmus*. On this, manifestly, we can come to no certain conclusion, but that the primary purpose was a slighting comparison of Pompey's achievements with his own seems indisputable.

These were not the only instances of comparisons made by Caesar between Pompey and himself, or of efforts on his part to surpass Pompey's accomplishments<sup>75</sup>.

Suetonius<sup>76</sup> tells us that among Caesar's projects frustrated by his death was *theatrum . . . summae magnitudinis Tarpeio monti accubans*. We are of course reminded of Pompey's great theater, erected in 55 B. C., the first permanent theater in Rome. Dio<sup>77</sup> does not permit us to forget Pompey's theater or Caesar's purpose in building one. "Being anxious to build a theater, as Pompey had done, he laid the foundations but did not finish it". Clearly the projected theater was intended to surpass that erected by Pompey.

Doubtless, too, Caesar's temple to Venus Genetrix was intended to outstrip Pompey's temple to Venus Victrix.

Again, Pompey had erected a trophy on the Pyrenees<sup>78</sup>; as this had not been well regarded, Caesar in his turn, when he crossed the Pyrenees, built a great altar of polished stones "not far from his rival's trophies"<sup>79</sup>.

We must remember, too, that the Senate had voted to Caesar *supplicationes* of fifteen, and even more, days for his Gallic victories, greater *supplicationes* than any one before him had received<sup>80</sup>, greater, in other words, than Pompey had received for any of his victories.

In a number of features Caesar's triumphs and the games that accompanied them seem to suggest a purpose to vie with what Pompey had done. Pompey, for example, had on the occasion of his first triumph planned to enter Rome in a carriage drawn by elephants<sup>81</sup>. Caesar, as we have seen, on the day of his dinner to the populace, when he made his way home at evening, had twenty elephants bearing torches on his right, twenty on his left. In 55 B. C., at Pompey's games, twenty elephants fought against armed Gaetu-

lians<sup>82</sup>. Caesar in his turn caused a battle to take place in which 500 footsoldiers, 20 elephants, and 30 horsemen engaged on each side<sup>83</sup>. Another account states that at their respective games Pompey had 18 elephants and 500 lions<sup>84</sup>, while Caesar had 400 lions<sup>85</sup> and 40 elephants.

Pompey had introduced to Rome the rhinoceros, the lynx, and a species of African ape never seen again<sup>86</sup>. Similarly Caesar presented the giraffe (*camelopardis*) for the first time in Rome.

In his triumph Pompey had a silver statue of Pharnaces, first King of Pontus, and also of Mithridates Eupator<sup>87</sup>. A gold statue of the Ocean appeared in Caesar's triumph.

Moreover, among the first *dactylithecae*, or collections of gems, at Rome was that of Pompey<sup>88</sup>. After mentioning it Pliny goes on to say: "Following his example the Dictator Caesar consecrated six *dactylithecae* in the temple of Venus Genetrix".

Caesar was, however, not content to follow in Pompey's footsteps; in giving a mock sea-battle, for example, Caesar was producing something that Pompey had not suggested.

It is not impossible that Caesar's search for pearls in Britain, of which Suetonius tells us<sup>89</sup>, may have been due to a desire to deck his future triumph lavishly with them in order to surpass even Pompey's profuse use of them. But the British pearls were poor, and so not only did Caesar not try to outdo Pompey in this respect, but we have not a single mention of pearls in connection with his triumphs<sup>90</sup>.

These triumphs were meant to eclipse all previous triumphs, particularly those of Pompey, and their purpose was accomplished. Says Cicero, in *Pro M. Marcello*<sup>91</sup>, speaking in the very year of Caesar's four triumphs: *Obstupescit posteris certe imperia, provincias, Rhenum, Oceanum, Nilum, pugnas innumera-bilis, incredibilis victorias, monumenta, munera, triumphos audientes et legentes tuos*. One year later, in his *Pro Deiotaro*<sup>92</sup>, Cicero again addresses Caesar and again refers to his triumphs, but this time in that comparison which Caesar had been so eager to have made: *Itaque Cn. Pompei bella, victorias, triumphos, consulatus admirantes numerabamus; tuos enumerare non possumus*. From the lips of Rome's greatest orator had fallen the acknowledgment that in all he had done, wars, victories, triumphs, and consulships, he had far outstripped Pompey.

This must, of course, not be ascribed to a passion for splendor or to envy of his rival. Caesar knew the nature of men and, above all, of the people of Rome. And his policy all through his life had been to seek to win the people by lavish expenditure. Says Sallust, in his comparison between Caesar and Cato<sup>93</sup>, Caesar *beneficiis ac munificentia magnus habebatur*, and

<sup>74</sup>Philological Quarterly 3.237 (July, 1924).

<sup>75</sup>Compare Caesar, B. C. 1.32: *Se vero, ut operibus anteire studuerit, sic iustitia et aequitate velle superare*. Mr. Peskett (in the Loeb Classical Library) translates this as follows: "His own wish was to be superior to others in justice and equity as he had striven to surpass them in action". The context suggests that a comparison with Pompey is implied.

<sup>76</sup>Iulius 44.1.

<sup>77</sup>Pliny, N. H. 7.96.

<sup>78</sup>Caesar, B. G. 2.35, 4.38, 7.90; Plutarch, Caesar 21.

<sup>79</sup>Pliny, N. H. 8.4; Plutarch, Pompey 14.

<sup>80</sup>Pliny, N. H. 8.20.

<sup>81</sup>Dio 39.38.2; Pliny, N. H. 8.53, declares that Pompey exhibited six hundred lions.

<sup>82</sup>Pliny, N. H. 8.53.

<sup>83</sup>Pliny, N. H. 33.151. Appian, *Mithridatica* 116, declares that the statue of Mithridates Eupator was of solid gold.

<sup>84</sup>Pliny, N. H. 37.11.

<sup>85</sup>Compare the article entitled *Caesar and the Pearls of Britain*, *The Classical Journal* 19.503-505 (May, 1924).

<sup>86</sup>28.

<sup>87</sup>Catiline 54.

<sup>88</sup>Suetonius, Iulius 39.3.

<sup>89</sup>Dio 39.38.2; Pliny, N. H. 8.53, declares that Pompey exhibited six hundred lions.

<sup>90</sup>Pliny, N. H. 8.53.

<sup>91</sup>Pliny, N. H. 33.151. Appian, *Mithridatica* 116, declares that the statue of Mithridates Eupator was of solid gold.

<sup>92</sup>Pliny, N. H. 37.11.

<sup>93</sup>Compare the article entitled *Caesar and the Pearls of Britain*, *The Classical Journal* 19.503-505 (May, 1924).

again<sup>4</sup>, ... is <Caesar> privatim egregia liberalitate, publice maxumis muneribus grandem pecuniam debebat. And as this had been his policy in the past, and he knew besides that Pompey's great shows had deeply impressed and gratified the crowd, was it not most natural that he should see that his fame in that respect and popular approval of his triumphs could only be secured by outstripping those of Pompey? This he aimed to do, and, by and large, this he unquestionably accomplished.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MONROE E. DEUTSCH

## REVIEW

Catullus in English Poetry. By Eleanor Shipley Duckett. Smith College Classical Studies, Number 6. Northampton, Massachusetts (1925). Pp. 199.

Teachers of Latin who believe in a judicious use of literary parallels will welcome this new study of the influence of Catullus on the English poets. It covers a long period, from John Skelton (1460?-1529) down to the present day. Allusions, quotations, imitations, and even a number of selected translations, are carefully set down, with the Latin text conveniently placed for comparison. A part of the material was printed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 15.177-180.

A few additional notes may be suggested.

The poem Vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus is echoed in Samuel Daniel's Pastoral O happy Golden Age (1592):

Let's loue: the sun doth set, and rise againe,  
But whenas our short light

Comes once to set, it makes eternall night—

though Daniel was really translating here from Tasso's *Aminta*.

In George Chapman's *Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois* (1613), Act 1, Scene 2, one is reminded of Egnatius and his white teeth (Catullus 39):

Heard he a Lawyer, neuer so vehement pleading,  
Hee stood and laught. Heard hee a Trades-man  
swearing

Neuer so thriftily (selling of his wares;)  
He stood and laught. Heard hee an holy brother,  
For hollow ostentation at his prayers  
Ne'er so impetuously; hee stood and laught.

Saw hee a great man neuer so insulting,  
Seuerely inflicting, grauely giuing lawes,  
Not for their good, but his; hee stood and laught.  
Saw hee a youthful widow

Neuer so weeping, wringing of her hands,  
For her lost Lord, still the Philosopher laught.

And in Act 2, Scene 3, of the same play we have Catullus's Sufferus (22):

And as the foolish Poet that still writ  
All his most selfe-lou'd verse in paper royall,  
Of Parchment rul'd with Lead, smooth'd with the  
Pumice,

Bound richly vp, and strung with Crimson strings;  
Neuer so blest as when hee writ and read  
The Ape-lou'd issue of his braine; and neuer  
But ioying in himselfe; admiring euer:  
Yet in his workes behold him, and hee show'd  
Like to a ditcher.

Catullus 43.8, is quoted at the close of Chapman's *Justification of Perseus and Andromeda*:

<sup>4</sup>*Ibidem*, 49. Compare also Dio 37.8.

For of your whole reckonings here's the sum,  
O saeculum insipiens, et inficetum.

It might be added that Tennyson's metrical experiment entitled *Hendecasyllabics* was "All composed in a metre of Catullus"; and that Tennyson once said, "*Collis O Heliconii* is in a beautiful metre. I wrote a great part of my *Jubilee Ode* in it" (Memoir, 2.400).

As for the translations in verse, they are largely a matter of individual taste, and every teacher will feel free to accept Miss Duckett's selections or substitute something he likes better. Personally, I am sorry she did not include the beautiful version of the hymn to Diana by R. C. Jebb (1878); it is one of the best translations I know. Here are two sample stanzas:

O Latonia, pledge of love  
Glorious to most glorious Jove,  
Near the Delian olive-tree  
Latona gave thy life to thee,  
That thou should'st be for ever queen  
Of mountains and of forests green;  
Of every deep glen's mystery;  
Of all streams and their melody.

It is quoted in R. Y. Tyrrell's *Latin Poetry*, 112 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1895).

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

W. P. MUSTARD

### THE LYSISTRATA OF ARISTOPHANES ACTED BY RUSSIAN PLAYERS IN RUSSIAN

The recent performance, in New York City, of the *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes, by the Moscow Art Theatre Musical Studio was a very interesting presentation of a play which by its theme and its treatment is especially appropriate at this time in which questions of sex and peace fill all fields of our life.

The revolving stage with its representation of the Acropolis, and the uniform color of the background were in accord with the most improved and modern practices of the Russian theater.

The grouping and the tableaux were most excellent, and, as they were projected against the background, they reminded one of the friezes and the painted backgrounds of Greek works of art. The chorus, too, was handled most dramatically, but many of the choral parts were developed from mere suggestions in the original.

Besides this, we must not overlook the great difference in the atmosphere of the two plays. The editor of the English translation sold at the theater stated that the adapters aimed "to preserve as faithfully as possible not only the spirit of the original but also its form". He poured scorn on the conventional English translations for toning down the frank language of Aristophanes, but it requires little comparison of the Greek, the Russian, and the English to see that the adapters have done the same thing. Gone are all the phallic references in the play, and the references to the Athenian politicians of the day.

We may therefore sum up the performance by saying that it was an admirable piece of work, but that it was not Aristophanes, in exactly the same sense that the *Faust* of Gounod is not the *Faust* of Goethe, or that the epics of Nonnus are not those of Homer. The performance lacked that superb balance between exuberance and moderation that marked Greek art of the best period. It showed us, perhaps, as we have not been showed before, the possibilities of Aristophanes the comedian and the politician, but it does not show us the Aristophanes who could appreciate and fuse into such gay and unrestrained productions serious literary criticism as well.

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVONIC  
LANGUAGES,  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

CLARENCE A. MANNING